

### REMARKS

Claims 16-22 have been renumbered by the Patent Office from claims 8-15 and remain pending in the above-referenced application for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The claims have been objected to because in the opinion of the Examiner they are misnumbered. Relying on the new numbering set forth in the Office Action, Applicants have amended the preambles of the dependent claims to reflect this new numbering. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In view of the amendment made to this claim, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-19, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,351,041 to Ikata et al. ("Ikata"). A claim is anticipated under Section 102 only if every limitation in the claim is identically found in a single prior art reference. Applicants submit that Ikata does not anticipate claim 16 because Ikata does not teach the step of "coordinating the at least one second logical component on the application plane by the at least one first logical component as a function of a result of the comparison." Indeed, the Examiner does not even address this limitation since nowhere in the discussion of claim 16 is there any mention of any coordination done by the Ikata system. Unless the Examiner can point specifically to which portion of Ikata identically teaches such a step, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

As for claims 17-19, 21, and 22, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 16. Notwithstanding the above, Applicants further submit that nothing in Ikata teaches or even suggests the reconstructing step in claim 19, which was amended for clarification purposes only. Even though the Examiner included this claim in the rejection, the Examiner does not specifically discuss any portion of Ikata that involves such a reconstructing step. Unless the Examiner can point to a specific portion of Ikata that identically teaches such a step, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

As for the Section 103 rejection of claim 20 in view of Ikata and United States Patent No. 5,251,211 to Mutoh ("Mutoh"), Applicants submit that since Mutoh does not overcome the deficiencies noted above with respect to Ikata, Claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 16.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the present application is new, non-obvious, and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/14/04

By: Richard L. Mayer  
Richard L. Mayer  
Reg. No. 22,490

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200